

Appl. No. : 09/912,646  
Filed : July 24, 2001

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 31 2006

### SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

In the telephonic interview conducted on October 16, 2006, Applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed the differences between electronic pages that are selectable with pages remaining in the background and the media access panel described by the cited reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609 to Katinsky et al.).

Claim 1 was discussed as well as potential claim limitations drawn towards tabs for multiple web pages within a browser window or automatically updating a hidden page when changes are made to the viewable page. No agreement with the Examiner was reached during the interview.

Appl. No. : 09/912,646  
Filed : July 24, 2001

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 31 2006

### REMARKS

In the pending Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended, and Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Thus, Claims 1-22 are presented for further examination. Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 1-22 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 19 can be found on page 19, lines 4-11 which describes how selecting a tab results in a one electronic web page being displayed while another electronic web page is hidden.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 13, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609 to Katinsky et al.

In regard to Claim 1, the Examiner stated that "Katinsky teaches a system (abstract) for providing a distributed software application (col. 1, line 1 – col. 3, line 5), comprising:

a. A server (Fig. 1, #1020) comprising a stored (Fig. 10, #1010) electronic main page (Fig. 1, #10), wherein the main page comprises a first browser component (Fig. 1, #12 in view of Fig. 2, #22) configured to display a first electronic page (Fig. 2A) and a second browser component (Fig. 2, #22 and #28) configured to display a second electronic page within the main page (Figs. 2B and 2C);

b. A client computer (Fig. 10, #1030) comprising a browser program (Fig. 1) configured to establish a communication link with the server (col. 10, lines 15-20), download said first and second electronic pages (Figs. 11 and 12), and display the stored electronic main page (Fig. 2A), wherein said first browser component is active and displays said first electronic page to a user (col. 4, lines 25-60), and said second browser component is inactive and does not display said electronic page to the user (in Fig. 2A, the topics bulleted list electronic page is shown, while the news and people bulleted list electronic pages are hidden); and

c. At least one software control on the main page (Fig. 2, #22 and #28; tabs) for selecting between said first browser component and said second browser component (col. 4, lines 25-40), wherein selecting said first browser component results in said first electronic page being

Appl. No. : 09/912,646  
Filed : July 24, 2001

displayed to the user (Fig. 2A) and selecting said second browser component results in said second electronic page being displayed to the user (Fig. 2B)."

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicant respectfully submits that Katinsky fails to describe "at least one software control on the main page for selecting between said first browser component and said second browser component, wherein selecting said first browser component results in said first electronic page being displayed to the user and said second electronic page becoming hidden from said user and wherein selecting said second browser component results in said second electronic page being displayed to the user and said first electronic page becoming hidden from said user" as recited in Claim 1.

Katinsky describes a system for manipulating media objects including a media access area *Figs 1 and 2, #12*. However, Katinsky does not describe this media access area panel as displaying and hiding different electronic pages, but rather as accessing a database to reconstruct the outline within the existing panel each time an item is selected.

Katinsky describes a system for displaying and managing media files on a web page including a media access icon panel. *Abstract; Figs. 1, 2A and 2B, #12*. The media access icon panel displays an outline as a bulleted list. *Col. 4, lines 26-36; Figs. 2A and 2B, #24 and #26*. Clicking on the either the text of a bulleted item or a corresponding outline tab causes the next level of the outline to be displayed. *Col. 4, lines 37-41; Fig. 2B, #29*. At the lowest level of this outline are the actual media objects that are manipulated by the user. *Col. 4, lines 50-65, Fig. 2C, #30*. As each level of the outline is displayed, sections of the outline expand and collapse so that only one level of the outline is expanded at one time. *Col. 4, lines 42-45*.

As described by Katinsky, the process of expanding and collapsing the outline is not a matter of activating and hiding pages, but rather reconstructing the portion of the outline to be displayed on the existing page. The information to build the outline is contained in the interface database. *Col. 9, lines 34-39*. When a user clicks on a line or tab in the media access icon panel, a query is sent to the interface database which returns the information to be displayed. *Col. 11, lines 15-25*. When the interface database returns the information, it is stored in a temporary data

Appl. No. : 09/912,646  
Filed : July 24, 2001

source object before being copied to the DHTML array of the media access icon panel. *Col. 11, lines 29-38*. This DHTML array is the same array before and after any line or tab is selected. The content of media access icon panel is updated. *Col. 11, lines 41-51*. The panel itself is not replaced by another panel or object.

Thus, Katinsky fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, "at least one software control on the main page for selecting between said first browser component and said second browser component, wherein selecting said first browser component results in said first electronic page being displayed to the user and selecting said second browser component results in said second electronic page being displayed to the user" as recited in Claim 1. In contrast to the system of Claim 1, the media access area described by Katinsky represents a single page that is updated to display new information.

Therefore, as Katinsky fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, every element recited in Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

As Claims 10 and 19 recite limitations similar to those recited in Claim 1, the arguments with respect to Claim 1 similarly apply to Claims 10 and 19, and thus, Claims 10 and 19 are respectfully submitted for further review as patentable subject matter.

Because Claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 13, 17, and 18 depend from Claims 1 and 10, pursuant to U.S.C. §112, ¶4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent Claims, and for their other features.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky as applied to Claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of the MSHTML API Overview. The Examiner has rejected Claims 5-7, 14-16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky as applied to Claims 1, 10, and 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,952,799 to Edwards et al.

Because Claims 3, 5-7, 12, 14-16, and 20 depend from Claims 1, 10, and 19, pursuant to U.S.C. §112, ¶4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer.

Appl. No. : 09/912,646  
Filed : July 24, 2001

It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent Claims, and for their other features.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner wish to discuss these or any other issues regarding the aforementioned, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: October 31, 2006

By: 

Michael L. Fuller

Registration No. 36,516

Attorney of Record

Customer No. 20,995

(619) 235-8550

3065132  
102906